

## REMARKS

The applicants have cancelled claims 1-16 and added claims 17-31. Claims 17-31 are now pending. In light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections, and advancement of this application to allowance.

### **A. The Specification**

The examiner suggested specific headings and organization to the specification. The applicants thank the examiner for these suggestions. The applicants have amended the specification to include headings that frame the specification's organization.

The examiner noted that the application does not contain an abstract. The applicants have amended the application to include an abstract.

### **B. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112**

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the application does not conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. Similarly, claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the pending claims do not set forth a proper process. The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. In order to advance this application to allowance, however, the applicants have cancelled the pending claims and added new apparatus claims 17-31.

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112.

### **C. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected as being anticipated by Wang et al. Claim 4 stand rejected as being obvious over Wang et al. in view of Templeton. Claims 5-7 stand rejected as being

obvious over Wang et al. in view of Templeton and further in view of Li et al. Claims 8-15 stand rejected as being obvious over Wang et al. in view of Templeton and Li et al. and further in view of Susumu. The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Initially, the applicants note that the office action states that first two cited references, Wang et al. and Templeton, do not disclose "the poles of the rotor are arranged in different pole distances" The last cited reference, Sumunu, also fails to disclose any teachings regarding the position of the poles relative to one another.

Regarding Li et al., the office action states that it discloses a rotor in which "poles or the rotor are arranged in different pole distances (25) . . . ." However, having different pole distances between the poles is different than having asymmetrically positioned poles. Li acknowledges this difference and explicitly teaches away from the claimed structure. For example, at col. 5, lines 6-10 Li et al. teaches that "four outwardly extending pole portions 25 . . . are evenly dispersed around the perimeter of the rotor yoke, and are separated by equal angles . . ." (emphasis added). Li et al. goes on to teach at col. 6, lines 15-16 that the "rotor pole portions are arranged symmetrically . . ." (emphasis added).

In very sharp contrast to Li, the claimed structure includes "poles being asymmetrically positioned on the rotor." Therefore, the cited references do not teach or suggest the claimed structure. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections.

### **Conclusion**

The applicants respectfully submit that the pending application is in condition for allowance, and thus request advancement of this application to allowance. The applicants also note that there may be reasons and arguments that support patentability of any of the pending or

cancelled claims over the cited references. The applicants reserve the right to raise any such reason or argument in the future.


Please contact the undersigned attorney if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
612.332.5300

Date

October 18, 2001

  
John C. Reich  
Reg. No. 37,703  
JCR:PSTjt

